



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/488,286	01/20/2000	Tetsujiro Kondo	450100-02293	4230
20999	7590	05/08/2002	EXAMINER	
FROMMERM LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			VO, TUNG T	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2613		
DATE MAILED: 05/08/2002				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/488,286	KONDO ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Tung T. Vo	2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

*Priority*

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 09/488,286, filed on 01/20/00.

*Drawings*

2. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

*Response to Arguments*

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1- 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

It is noted that US Patent 6,336,811 filed 01/26/01 is divisional of application No. 09/276,739 filed 03/26/1999 that is after the filing date of the translated Japanese priority application No 11-013883, filed 01/22/99. Therefore, the U.S. Patent 6,336,811 is not the prior art.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2613

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoyama et al. (US 5,36,270) in view of Lougheed et al. (US 5,686,690).

Re claims 1-6 and 9, Aoyama discloses an information processing (fig. 1) for processing information that is read from the information read means (2 of fig. 1), the information read means reads out video and motion information from a memory (M of fig. 2), the motion information has been predetermined when the video data has been captured; an identification information (S1 of fig. 2) specifies the motion information based upon the selected means (1 of fig. 1) then sends the motion information to the motion means (4 of fig. 2) to generate the motion control in accordance with the motion information (col. 4, lines 16-34), the motion information is calculated or estimated in advance and sent to a servo mechanism (18 of fig. 2) to drive a chair (16 of fig. 2) in various directions such as upward, downward, acceleration, and motions or tilts back, forth, right, left and inherently in vertical, horizontal, a magnification rotation (col. 5, lines 11-26)

Re claims 7-8, Aoyama further discloses a display device (3 of fig. 1) to display an image signal (col. 4, lines 22-24), and the control signal to contain a plurality of components (col. 5, lines 11-26).

It is noted that Aoyama suggests the predetermined motion information that has been calculated or estimated in advance and then converted into oil pressure control information to drive a servomechanism (col. 5, lines 14-18), where the motions are measured or calculated in the images (col. 5, lines 14-15), synchronism with motion in the images.

Even though Aoyama does not specifically disclose a detector for detecting one motion vector for each block composed a plurality of pixels at predetermined position within a frame as specified in claims 1, 3, and 9.

However, Lougheed discloses a change detection (110 of fig. 9) to detect one motion vector for each block composed a plurality of pixels at predetermined position within a frame (col. 15, lines 14-44), where a summation (112 of fig. 1) computes the difference in intensity between pixels in the current frame and the preceding frame to produce one motion.

Taking the teachings of Lougheed and Aoyama as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the change detector (110 of fig. 9) of Lougheed with the information read means (2 of fig. 1) of Aoyama to detect the motion related-signal in accordance with an image signal.

Doing so would allow the processing apparatus to accurately detect motion information that would be sent to the servomechanism to move in various motions so that the user/player would enjoy the image in a real time.

Re claims 10-16, the claimed method is rejected by the combination of Lougheed and Aoyama for the same reasons above.

Re claims 17-23, since the combination of Lougheed and Aoyama teaches all of the limitations above, one skilled in the art would implement the limitations in such as a computer or recorder medium as desired.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See the previous Office Action, paper No. 9.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tung T. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-5874. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM - 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris. Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Tung T. Vo  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2613

T. Vo  
April 26, 2002

  
CHRIS KELLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600